

REMARKS

[0003] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. Claims 1-34 are presently pending. Claims amended herein are 1, 14, 15, and 28-34. No claims are withdrawn or cancelled herein. No new claims are added herein.

Formal Request for an Interview

[0004] If the Examiner's reply to this communication is anything other than allowance of all pending claims, then I formally request an interview with the Examiner. I encourage the Examiner to call me—the undersigned representative for the Applicant—so that we can talk about this matter so as to resolve any outstanding issues quickly and efficiently over the phone.

[0005] Please contact me to schedule a date and time for a telephone interview that is most convenient for both of us. While email works great for me, I welcome your call as well. My contact information may be found on the last page of this response.

Claim Amendments

[0006] Without conceding the propriety of the rejections herein and in the interest of expediting prosecution, Applicant amends claims 1, 14, 15, and 28-34 herein. Applicant amends claims to clarify claimed features. Such amendments are made to expedite prosecution and more quickly identify allowable subject matter. Such amendments are merely intended to clarify the claimed features,

and should not be construed as further limiting the claimed invention in response to the cited references.

Substantive Matters

Claim Rejections under § 101

[0007] Claims 29-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101. In light of the amendments presented herein, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims comply with the patentability requirements of §101 and that the §101 rejections should be withdrawn.

[0008] If the Examiner maintains the rejection of these claims, then Applicant requests additional guidance as to what is necessary to overcome the rejection.

Claim Rejections under § 103

[0009] The Examiner rejects claims 1-34 under § 103. For the reasons set forth below, the Examiner has not made a prima facie case showing that the rejected claims are obvious.

[0010] Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the § 103 rejections be withdrawn and the case be passed along to issuance.

[0011] The Examiner's rejections are based upon the following references in combination:

- **Beyda:** *Beyda, et al.*, US Patent No. 6,260,160 (issued July 10, 2001); and

- **Wittel, Jr.:** *Wittel, Jr., et al.*, US Patent Publication No. 2003/0195951 (Published October 16, 2003).

Overview of the Application

[0012] The Application describes a technology for obtaining information regarding an installed hardware device, whether or not the device is attached to the computer system. In a described implementation, a method includes collecting information regarding an installed device on a computing device. The information is presented (e.g., to an end-user with local access to the computing device). The installed device does not have to be attached to the computing device and no booting into a special mode (e.g., a troubleshooting mode) is required. The information may also be modified in response to a modification request (e.g., provided by an end-user through a graphical user interface). Furthermore, the information presented may include all data available to the operating system regarding the installed device.

Cited References

[0013] The Examiner cites Beyda as the primary reference in the obviousness-based rejections. The Examiner cites Wittel, Jr. as a secondary reference in the obviousness-based rejections.

Beyda

[0014] Beyda describes a technology for remotely troubleshooting a local computer connected to an array of local peripheral devices include a data collector connected to the local computer. The data collector includes a signal interceptor for intercepting signaling information transmitted by the computer to the peripheral devices. The intercepted signaling information has been formatted for processing by the local peripheral devices at a point of interception. The data collector further includes a transceiver having a transceiver input configured to relay signaling information received from remote peripheral devices located at a remote troubleshooting site to input/output (I/O) ports of local peripheral devices. A transceiver output is configured to transmit intercepted signaling information to the remote peripheral devices at the remote troubleshooting site. Each local peripheral device corresponds to a remote peripheral device having substantially identical functional and signaling capabilities as the local peripheral device. Upon receipt at a remote peripheral device, intercepted signaling information has a format which is substantially identical to the format of the intercepted signaling information at the point of interception. A technician located at the remote troubleshooting site is able to remotely operate the

computer via the data collector and is able to monitor performance of the remote peripheral devices to diagnose a malfunction associated with the local computer and the local peripheral devices.

Wittel, Jr.

[0015] Wittel, Jr. describes a technology for dynamically detecting, downloading and installing drivers on a client system. The present invention operates in a client/server architecture of a network environment. In operation, information relating to a client system is provided to a server, and that information is used to match available driver information located on the server to the received client system information.

Obviousness Rejections

Lack of *Prima Facie* Case of Obviousness (MPEP § 2142)

[0016] Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's obviousness rejections. Arguments presented herein point to various aspects of the record to demonstrate that all of the criteria set forth for making a prima facie case have not been met.

Based upon Beyda and Wittel

[0017] The Examiner rejects claims 1-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beyda and Wittel. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims and asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of these claims.

Independent Claim 1

[0018] Applicant submits that the combination of Beyda and Wittel does not teach or suggest at least the following elements as recited in this claim:

- "collecting, by a computing device, information about an installed device on the computing device"
- "presenting, by the computing device, the information on the computing device through a user interface"

[0019] In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner cites the abstract and col. 4, lines 11-30 of Beyda as teaching the collecting of information. That passage and others describe a data collector capable of intercepting signals between local peripheral devices and the computer to which they are coupled and of passing those signals on to a remote trouble shooting site. The data collector may also receive signals from remote peripherals of the remote trouble shooting site and pass those signals on to local peripherals. The Examiner also cited a secondary reference (Wittel) as describing that the information is presented "without booting the computing device into a special mode."

[0020] The combined references, however, do not teach or suggest "collecting, by a computing device, information about an installed device on the computing device." The "information" collected in Beyda is peripheral signals. Such signals are not information *about* the peripherals, as is required by claim 1. And while Wittel mentions collecting information, no disclosure is made of the information being "about an installed device on the computing device."

[0021] Also, the combined references do not teach or suggest "presenting, by the computing device, the information on the computing device through a user interface" No mention is made of presenting the information through a user interface, much less of presenting the information on the computing device that collected the information.

[0022] Further, given that the collected information in Beyda is peripheral device signals, it would make no sense to present the information through a user interface. Thus, by collecting peripheral device signals rather than information

about a peripheral device, Beyda actually teaches away from “presenting, by the computing device, the information on the computing device through a user interface.” And since the information in Wittel is only collected in order to obtain a catalog of drivers, one skilled in the art would not think to provide a user interface to present that information either.

[0023] As shown above, the combination of Beyda and Wittel does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Independent Claims 15 and 29

[0024] Claims 15 and 29 include recitations similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 1. Accordingly, claims 15 and 29 are patentable over Beyda for at least the same reasons. Also, claim 29 includes recitations similar to those of claims 7 and 11 which, as discussed below, are patentable over Beyda and Wittel for additional reasons.

Dependent Claims 2-14, 16-28, and 30-34

[0025] These claims ultimately depend upon independent claims 1, 15, and 29. As discussed above, claims 1, 15, and 29 are allowable. It is axiomatic that any dependent claim which depends from an allowable base claim is also allowable. Additionally, some or all of these claims may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

[0026] Further, claim 7 recites “wherein the information is presented in response to a user selecting the installed device.” No mention is made in the combined references of presenting any information (as discussed above), much less of presenting any information *in response to* selection of a device that the information is *about*. The passage of Beyda cited by the Examiner as teaching this feature (col. 7, lines 55-60) does not even mention selecting a device, much less presenting information in response to selecting a device.

[0027] Additionally, claim 11 recites “wherein the information is presented to a local user.” No mention is made in the combined references of presenting the information about the installed device to the local user. In fact, the Examiner admits Beyda does not teach presenting the information to a local user. In support of the rejection, the Examiner cites a passage of Wittel as disclosing the features of all of claims 8-11. Nowhere in that passage, however, is there any mention of presenting information to a local user.

Conclusion

[0028] All pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the **Examiner is urged to contact me before issuing a subsequent Action.** Please call or email me at your convenience.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representatives for Applicant

/Robert C. Peck/

Dated: October 21, 2008

Kasey C. Christie (Kasey@leehayes.com; x232)

Registration No. 40,559

Robert C. Peck (robp@leehayes.com; 425.677.5750)

Registration No. 56,826

Customer No. **22801**

Telephone: (509) 324-9256

Facsimile: (509) 323-8979

www.leehayes.com